UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/53/705
S/1998/1122
25 November 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-third session
Agenda items 62 and 85
QUESTION OF CYPRUS
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF
PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 24 November 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 24 November 1998, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 62 and 85, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Volkan VURAL
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-37305 (E) 271198

/...

Annex

Letter dated 24 November 1998 from Mr. Aytuğ Plümer addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot representative at the meeting of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) held on 2 November 1998 under agenda item 85 ("Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects") (see A/C.4/53/SR.14). The statement contains allegations that grossly distort the realities of Cyprus and demonstrate yet again that the Greek Cypriot side is more interested in generating rhetoric than seeking a realistic settlement of the Cyprus dispute. Since I am denied the right of speak in the said Committee due to the usurpation by the Greek Cypriot side of the title of the "Government of Cyprus", I am compelled to respond to these allegations in writing.

The Greek Cypriot representative, in a vain attempt to conceal the responsibility of the Greek Cypriot side in creating and perpetuating the conflict on the island, once again refers to the legitimate Turkish intervention in Cyprus as an "invasion". I wish to recall that it was the Greek Cypriot armed onslaught in December 1963 against the Turkish Cypriot people and the binational order that led to the division on the island when the Turkish Cypriot people were forced to live in enclaves, deprived of all basic necessities and fundamental human rights, for 11 years prior to the legitimate Turkish intervention of 1974. What has been called the "Green Line" was established in December 1963 so as to provide protection for defenceless Turkish Cypriots.

The Greek Cypriot representative conveniently forgets that on 15 July 1974, Greece and its collaborators on the island staged a bloody coup d'état in Cyprus aimed at the final extermination of the Turkish Cypriots in order to achieve Enosis (union of Cyprus with Greece). In the face of this imminent danger, Turkey had no alternative but to exercise its rights and obligations set out by the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee and intervened on 20 July 1974, averting the colonization of the island by Greece (see the then Greek Cypriot leader Archbishop Makarios' statement openly accusing Greece of invading Cyprus, contained in the verbatim record of the 1780th meeting of the Security Council, document S/PV.1780 of 19 July 1974). Turkey's military presence on the island serves as an effective deterrent against the Greek-Greek Cypriot irredentist policies and the potential for renewed aggression against the Turkish Cypriots, as occurred during the period 1963-1974.

The Greek Cypriot representative attempts to rewrite the recent history of the island by claiming that the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was established in 1964 after the Greek Cypriot wing of the once binational Republic of Cyprus invoked the assistance of the United Nations in December 1963 when faced with the threat of intervention! Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the very reason UNFICYP was established in the first place, under Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, and dispatched to the island was to prevent the massacre of the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriots. It is noteworthy, for instance, that George Ball,

who was the United States Under-Secretary of State at the time and visited the island in February 1964, records the following in his memoirs: "Three or four vignettes of my Cyprus days stand out sharply in my memory. A massacre took place in Limassol on the south coast in which, as I recall, about fifty Turkish Cypriots were killed - in some cases by bulldozers crushing their flimsy houses." Mr. Ball goes on to recount how he consequently admonished Archbishop Makarios, telling him that "the world is not going to stand idly by and let you turn this beautiful little island into your private abattoir" (The Past Has Another Pattern, p. 341). Furthermore, in stark contrast to the claims made by the Greek Cypriot representative, Mr. Ball recalls having reported the following to Washington, D.C., at the time: "... The Greek Cypriots, I wrote, do not want a peacekeeping force; they just want to be left alone to kill Turkish Cypriots" (ibid., p. 345).

Evidently, the real lesson to be learned from the United Nations peacekeeping experience in Cyprus is that even when the Security Council mandates UNFICYP to "use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law and order, and a return to normal conditions", this cannot prove possible when one of the parties to that dispute usurps the seat of government and uses it as a means of persecuting its former partner. Furthermore, on the peacemaking aspect, a political settlement can never be attained when the usurper regime acts to consolidate its illegal status rather than seeking a compromise which would entail sharing power with the very side it had forcefully ejected from all organs of the state and subjected to ethnic cleansing during the period 1963-1974. This aspect has been highlighted with the Greek Cypriot side's illegal and unilateral bid to secure full membership in the European Union on behalf of "Cyprus" as a whole. In the process, the Greek Cypriot side has destroyed all the parameters for a solution which had emerged within the framework of the Secretary-General's good offices mission.

The Greek Cypriot campaign of propaganda and defamation against the Turkish Cypriot side indicates that the Greek Cypriot side is not interested in the resolution of the Cyprus dispute but rather prefers the present state of affairs under which it is treated as the "Government of Cyprus" and sees the prospect of becoming a full member of the European Union in the name of "Cyprus". Those parties interested in a peaceful resolution must accord equal treatment to the two states in Cyprus, if ever the Greek Cypriot administration is to have an incentive to seek a realistic settlement.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 42 and 85, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Aytuğ PLÜMER
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus